REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for total consideration given the present application. Claims 1-39 were pending prior to the Office Action of which claim 35 has been canceled through this Reply. Therefore, claims 1-34 and 36-39 are currently pending of which claims 9-28 stand withdrawn as being directed to non-elected invention. By this Amendment, claims 1, 29, 30, 33, 34, 36, and 39 have been amended. Upon careful review, one would conclude that no new matter has been added to the application via this Amendment. Claims 1, 29, 34, and 36 are independent. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims in light of the above amendments and following remarks.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants thank the Examiner for granting a Personal Interview with the Applicants' representative on July 28, 2008. During the interview, possible claim amendments were discussed. Further, appropriateness of rejections of claims 37-39 was also discussed in that the Examiner failed to provide any motivation as required under 35 U.S.C. §103.

REJECTION UNDER § 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

Claims 1-8 and 37-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph, for allegedly containing subject matter not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention at the time of filing. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants point out that MPEP § 2163 sets forth guidelines for the examination of patent applications under the "Written Description" requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph. Specifically, the second paragraph of MPEP § 2163.I.B indicates that the requirement for the specification to support added claim limitations is not an in *haec verba* requirement (i.e., the specification is not required to use the exact language in the claims). Instead, this section of the

MKM/AMI/bms

MPEP indicates that the specification may support added claim limitations through express, implicit, or inherent disclosure.

Furthermore, MPEP § 2163.II.A lists the methodology for the Examiner to follow in order to determine the adequacy of the Written Description. This methodology includes the following steps:

1. For each claim, determine what the claim as a whole covers;

2. Review the entire application to understand how Applicants provide support for the claimed invention including each element and/or step; and

3. Determine whether there is sufficient Written Description to inform a skilled artisan that Applicants were in possession of the claimed invention as a whole at the time the application was filed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner did not follow this methodology in rejecting the claims. Instead, it appears that the Examiner concluded that a particular claim element, i.e., "without developer involvement," as recited in claim 1, is not enabled because the exact language is not found in the specification. Applicants respectfully submit that such analysis is not permitted according to the aforementioned methodology required by the MPEP.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that the claimed term "without developer involvement" is clearly described in the specification. For example, page 2, lines 1-3 and 11-14 of paragraph [05] recites, "There is real need in the industry for methods and apparatuses that *remove the software programmer* from writing code (or machine instructions) using an underlying low-level software language in order to generate an output that is computer-executable. . . . Thus, enabling the *user* to design an application at a high level while generating computer-executable instructions as an output that is scalable (i.e., *capable of being executed on different computer platforms at run time*) would be very beneficial to advancing the art." *Emphasis added.* It is clear to one of ordinary skill in the art that such user can design an application at a high level *without* the involvement of a developer or programmer.

MKM/AMI/bms

Although Applicants do not necessarily agree with the Examiner that the specification does not support for the claimed term "without developer involvement", claim 1 has been amended by deleting "without developer involvement" and inserting "the process being associated with a process type", in order to expedite prosecution.

The Examiner further alleges that claim 39 has no support in the specification. Applicants again earnestly request the Examiner to review page 17, paragraphs [44]-[46] of the instant specification. For example, support for the "user-selected customization" as recited in claim 39 is found in paragraphs [45] and [46]. Applicants again wish to remind the Examiner that there is no requirement that the specification use the exact language of the claims.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

35 U.S.C. § 103 REJECTION – Jabri, Hollingsworth

Claims 1-8 and 29-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Jabri (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0066074 A1)[hereinafter "Jabri"] in view of Hollingsworth et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,444,836)[hereinafter "Hollingsworth"]. Applicants respectfully traverse.

For a Section 103 rejection to be proper, a *prima facie* case of obviousness must be established. *See M.P.E.P. 2142.* One requirement to establish *prima facie* case of obviousness is that the prior art references, when combined, must teach or suggest all claim limitations. *See M.P.E.P. 2142; M.P.E.P. 706.02(j).* Thus, if the cited references fail to teach or suggest one or more elements, then the rejection is improper and must be withdrawn.

In this instance, it is respectfully submitted that neither Jabri nor Hollingsworth, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests each and every claim elements of independent claims 1, 29, 34, and 36.

For example, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*,

(b)   generating a high-level code emission for the process *with an association between the model for the process and an user-selected supported, inserted graphical shape-construct corresponding to a visual image*; the process being specified by the visual image on the visual display surface; and

(c)   transforming the high-level code emission into computer-executable instructions; through,

determining a first contextual evaluation whether the supported, inserted graphical shape-construct of step (b) is consistent with semantics corresponding to visual language logic module querying high-level language semantics module which contains semantics for the process type corresponding to previously selected supported, selected graphical shape-construct,

generating an indicator in a proximity of the inserted graphical shape-construct for updating corresponding visual image of the process type if step (b) is inconsistent with said semantics; and

transforming the association between the model and the high-level code emission for the process into computer-executable instructions.

As best understood, there is simply nothing in Jabri or Hollingsworth that remotely suggests a method for designing a process which includes the above-identified claim features.

That is to say that, by a first contextual evaluation of the user-selected supported, inserted graphical shape-construct (hereinafter "construct" or "constructs"), the system determines from a high-level code emission whether the construct *is consistent with semantics corresponding to visual language logic module querying high-level language semantics module which contains semantics for the process type corresponding to previously selected supported, selected graphical shape-construct* already upon the visual display surface. Next, *generating an indicator* in a proximity of the inserted graphical shape-construct for updating corresponding visual image of the process type if step (b) is inconsistent with said semantics and *transforming the association between the model and the high-level code emission for the process into computer-executable instructions*. Thus, the claimed invention allows a user to correct errors before generating computer-executable instructions from the high-level code emission, which also enables the user to design an application at a high-level generating computer-executable

instructions as an output that is capable of being executed on different computer platforms at run time. Thus, a user of the claimed invention does not need to interact with the underlying code using a low-level programming language to create the application.

Instead, and as Jabri is understood, it appears that the system of Jabri generally employs a modeling tool wherein the modeling tool is used to capture application logic at an abstract design level and then deploy the captured application logic into an execution platform. One example of the system in Jabri uses a universal modeling language (UML) for visually capturing object definitions. See, for example, Jabri at paragraphs 26 and 29. However, Jabri fails to generate a high-level code emission for the process _with an association between the model for the process and an user-selected supported, inserted graphical shape-construct corresponding to a visual image_; the process being specified by the visual image _on the visual display surface_.

The Examiner's mere allegation that Jabri's "visual modeling tool" is equivalent to the above-identified claim-feature is not sufficient to establish a _prima facie_ obviousness of the claim. Also, where a major technical rejection is proper, the rejection should be stated with a full development of reasons rather than by a mere conclusion coupled with some stereotyped expression. See _M.P.E.P. 707.07(g)_. As noted above, it is merely concluded that Jabri discloses generating a high-level code emission for the process _with an association between the model for the process and an user-selected supported, inserted graphical shape-construct corresponding to a visual image_; the process being specified by the visual image _on the visual display surface_, and this is coupled with a mere direction to "paragraph [0034]." The burden of stating the rejection with a full development of reasons has not been met. The relied upon section of Jabri merely discloses that the visual modeling tool provides a mechanism to deploy a captured application logic onto an execution platform. Jabri provides no teaching or suggestion that the step of deploying a captured application logic onto an execution platform includes a step of generating a high-level code emission for the process _with an association between the model for the process and an user-selected supported, inserted graphical shape-construct corresponding to a visual image_; the process being specified by the visual image _on the visual display surface_. Neither the cited portion nor any other portion of Jabri teaches or suggests the above-identified

MKM/AMI/bms

claim feature. If the rejection is maintained, Applicants request that the particular parts of the cited references be designated and a full development of reasons be provided.

The Examiner acknowledges that Jabri fails to teach or suggest, "transforming the high-level code emission into computer-executable instructions; through, determining a first contextual evaluation whether the supported, inserted graphical shape-construct of step (b) is compatible with any previously selected supported, selected graphical shape-construct, and only after having said compatibility is determined." Thus, the Examiner imports Hollingsworth as disclosing this feature. Particularly, the Examiner relies on col. 1, lines 52-62; col. 2, lines 56-61; and col. 3, lines 30-34 as disclosing the above-identified claim feature. Note that claim 1 has been amended further clarifying this "transforming" step. Applicants respectfully submit that neither the cited portions nor any other portions of Hollingsworth teach or suggest the above-identified claim feature.

Hollingsworth merely discloses a conventional method and system for placing user defined rules of graphical objects in a computer aided drafting (CAD) application. Particularly, Hollingsworth discloses rules for precise placement and overplotting of graphical objects that may be defined by a user with significant flexibility. For example, the user-defined rules may be applied by a placement subsystem to automate the proper placement of graphical objects according to the specific rules of the particular user. (*See abstract*). Hollingsworth uses a step of performing a query on a database subsystem to retrieve information on all graphical objects to be placed according to the structure being processed. Then, for each graphical object for which information is retrieved from the database subsystem, Hollingsworth's method applies placement rules to determine placement, orientation, labeling, and overplotting of each graphical object. Hollingsworth further discloses a rule specification file wherein entries in the file specify the query element and associated placement rules.

The above-described steps of precise placement and overplotting of graphical objects of Hollingsworth does not teach or suggest transforming a high-level code emission into computer-executable instructions by "determining a first contextual evaluation whether the supported,

MKM/AMI/bms

inserted graphical shape-construct of step (b) is consistent with semantics corresponding to visual language logic module querying high-level language semantics module which contains semantics for the process type corresponding to previously selected supported, selected graphical shape-construct, and generating an indicator in a proximity of the inserted graphical shape-construct for updating corresponding visual image of the process type if step (b) is inconsistent with said semantics" as recited in claim 1. Although Hollingsworth discloses "high level keyword" statement, such "high level keyword" statement is not a high-level code emission which has been transformed into computer executable instructions by the above-identified steps of "determining a first contextual evaluation" and "generating an indicator" The "high level" keyword statement of Hollingsworth is simply a part of the rule specification file whose value contains additional keyword statements.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that the combined invention of Jabri and Hollingsworth fails to teach or suggest the claimed combination of elements recited by amended claim 1, and similarly found in amended claims 29, 34 and 36. As such, claims 1, 29, 34 and 36 are clearly patentable. Because claims 2-8, 30-33, and 37-39 depend from claim 1, 29, 34 and 36, claims 2-8, 30-33, and 37-39 are at least patentable by virtue of their dependency as well as for their additional recitations.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's obviousness rejection of claims 37-39 is clearly erroneous. **The Examiner failed to provide any motivational statement as required under 35 U.S.C. §103 to establish *prima facie* obviousness of claims 37-39.** Thus, if this rejection is maintained, the Examiner is requested to provide proper motivation to combine these two references.

Accordingly, the immediate withdrawal of the prior art rejections of claims 1-8 and 29-34 and 36-39 under section 103 is respectfully requested.

MKM/AMI/bms

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Ali M. Imam Reg. No. 58,755 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.147; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: September 10, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By _____ #58,755

Michael K. Mutter
Registration No.: 29,680
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant

MKM/AMI/bms